

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated February 10, 2004. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-14 and 28 are pending in the case.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 3-5, 10, and 12-14 are allowed, and that claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (see Office Action mailed August 20, 2003).

Claims 6, 8, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kardis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,684,672) in view of Zibrik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,138,328). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Kardis and Zibrik teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 6, 8, and 9.

Claim 6 claims, *inter alia*, "first housing has a rib on its outer portion which projects from the side opposed to said second housing wherein said rib contains a plate type antenna which transmits and receives radio signals for communicating data between said computer terminal and outside, wherein said rib projects perpendicularly from the side of said first housing opposed to said second housing."

Kardis teaches a whip type antenna within a cylindrical housing (see Figure 2). Kardis does not teach a rib projecting perpendicularly from the side of a first housing opposed to a second housing, essentially as claimed in claim 6. Kardis teaches that the whip antenna is an extension of a cover or built into the cover (see Figures 1 and 4). The whip antenna of Kardis extends in a plane of the cover. The whip antenna does not project perpendicularly from the

cover. Therefore, Kardis fails to teach or suggest a rib projecting “perpendicularly from the side of said first housing opposed to said second housing” as claimed in claim 6.

Zibrik teaches a printed circuit board antenna (see col. 3, lines 3-7) mounted to a counterpoise via mounting posts (see Figure 2). The antenna of Zibrik is orthogonal to the plane of the counterpoise. However, as shown in Figures 2 and 3, the antenna of Zibrik does not extend perpendicularly from the counterpoise. The antenna of Zibrik extends from a mounting post. Therefore, Zibrik fails to teach or suggest a rib projecting “perpendicularly from the side of said first housing opposed to said second housing” as claimed in claim 6.

The combined teachings of Kardis and Zibrik fail to teach or suggest a rib projecting “perpendicularly from the side of said first housing opposed to said second housing” as claimed in claim 6. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9 and 28 depend from claim 6. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 6.

Accordingly, the application, including claims 1, 3-10, 12-14 and 28, is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above. For the forgoing reasons, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 501
East Meadow, New York 11554
(516) 357-0091
(516) 357-0092 (FAX)